



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,688	06/29/2001	Sang Kap Park	K-299	4954

34610 7590 12/28/2004

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

GODDARD, BRIAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/893,688	Applicant(s) PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian Goddard	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 21 June 2004.
2. Claims 1-21 and 23-58 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 37, 39, 43 and 45 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 21 June 2004, claim 22 was cancelled, and claims 1-21, 23-49 and 51-58 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,895,450 to Sloo.

Referring to claim 1, Sloo discloses a customer relationship management system as claimed. See Figure 1 and Column 13, line 59 et seq. for the details of this disclosure. Sloo teaches “a customer relationship management system [See Fig. 1] comprising:

a server [12] configured to collect request information [‘recorded objects’ (See Column 12, line 32 et seq. and Column 13, line 59 et seq.))] concerning a customer request, to collect customer sensitivity information [e.g. ‘satisfaction level’ (See Column 13, line 59 et seq.))] concerning a sensitivity of the customer, and to provide at least one

behavioral pattern example ['recommend a best behavior regarding the interaction...'] (See Column 13, line 59 et seq.)] on how to interact with the customer based on the collected customer sensitivity information" as claimed.

Claim 8 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. See the discussion regarding claim 1 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 2-4, 7, 9 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,652 to Sisley et al.

Referring to claim 2, Sloo discloses the customer relationship management system of claim 1, as above, further comprising:

a database [Not Numbered. See Fig. 1 & entirety of specification] configured to store the request information, the customer sensitivity information, and the at least one behavioral pattern [See Column 13, line 59 et seq.];

a transfer mechanism ['warning response module' (Column 13, line 59 et seq.)] configured to transfer the customer sensitivity information and the at least one behavioral pattern to at least one responding person ['participant']; and

a service progress confirming server [See Figs. 1 & 7-9] configured to update a current progress state by continuously confirming a current progress state of the responding person [See Fig. 9].

Sloo does not explicitly teach the storage of personnel information about responding persons that may be selected to respond to the customer request as claimed.

Sisley discloses a customer relationship management system similar to that of Sloo. See Figures 1-6 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure. Sisley teaches a customer relationship management system [See Figs. 1-2] comprising:

- a database [SMS database (not numbered; See column 6, line 25 et seq.)] configured to store request information [service call attributes 30], customer sensitivity information [e.g. technician preference, priority/urgency of request, etc.], at least one behavioral pattern [assignment attributes: e.g. commitment stress value, primary technician stress value, territory stress value, etc. (See column 17, line 25 – column 19, line 16)] and personnel information about responding persons that may be selected to respond to the customer request;

- a transfer mechanism [12] configured to transfer the customer sensitivity information and the at least one behavioral pattern to at least one selected [See Figs. 1-3 & corresponding portions of specification] responding person [18]; and

- a service progress confirming server [Assigner 22 (in conjunction with the modification above)] configured to update a current progress state [field event data and call status] by continuously confirming a current progress state of the responding person [See column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 67] as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the customer relationship management systems/methods of Sloo & Sisley, so as to add Sloo's recommended behavioral pattern example functionality for interacting with customers to Sisley's systems and methods, to obtain the invention as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so in order to minimize dissatisfaction among participants as disclosed by Sloo (See Column 13, line 59 et seq.), while providing the most qualified responding person as disclosed by Sisley, for a better overall level of customer service as desired by both.

Referring to claim 3, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure. Sisley (as modified by Sloo) teaches the system of claim 2, as above, further comprising an information extraction mechanism [Sisley: Assigner 22 (in conjunction with the modification above)] configured to extract information on a specified responding person that is best suited to handle the customer's request [with skills matching the needs of the service request] based on the personnel information about the responding persons [28] and customer's request [Sisley: See column 9, lines 20-34], and to provide the extracted information on the specified responding person to the customer [See Figs. 1-2] as claimed.

Referring to claim 4, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 1-2 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure. Sisley (as modified by Sloo) teaches the system of claim 2, further comprising a service performance

confirming mechanism [Sisley: Assigner 22 (in conjunction with the modification above)] configured to receive performance completion information [call completion time, call duration, and call status attributes] concerning the customer's request from the responding person, and to register the performance completion information in the database [See columns 5-6] as claimed.

Referring to claim 7, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 1 and the corresponding portion of Sisley's specification, as well as Figure 1 and the corresponding portion of Sloo's specification, for the details of this disclosure. Sloo v. Sisley teaches the system of claim 2, as above, wherein a terminal of the responding person [Sisley: 18; Sloo: 14] is a individual personal computer or portable wire/radio phone, which can receive information from the transfer mechanism [Sloo: 12; Sisley: 12 (See above)] through communication networks...[Sloo: See Fig. 1], or search and register information concerning the customer's request by directly accessing the transfer mechanism [See above] as claimed.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claim 2, in light of the basis for claim 8. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2 and 8 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claim 15, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure. Sloo v. Sisley teaches the method of claim 8, as above, further comprising the steps of:

confirming an area where the customer is positioned ['location of the machine'] and time zone for providing a response to the customer's request ['initiation time' and 'expiration time'];

obtaining schedule information [technician calendar] of possible responding persons in charge of a service field [technician skill set] requested by the customer among a plurality of responding persons who are allocated with the corresponding area [technician service territory] as their service providing area;

extracting information on the responding persons who are not responding [have low stress value for the request] in the time zone when the customer wants to receive the response based on the obtained schedule information [See Figs. 2-4 & corresponding portions of specification];

displaying the extracted information...[See claim 3 above and column 10, lines 44-49]; and

registering in a database...[See above] as claimed.

Claims 16-17 are rejected on the same basis as claim 4, in light of the basis for claim 9 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis as claim 7, in light of the basis for claim 17 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 17 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 19 and 20, the system and method of Sisley in view of Bushey as applied to claim 17 above discloses the invention as claimed. In particular,

the customer is informed of the scheduled visit in advance as claimed. See Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure.

5. Claims 5-6, 10-14, 21 and 23-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,400 to Bushey et al.

Referring to claim 5, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above does not explicitly transfer a message for confirming the service satisfaction to the terminal of a specified customer if service providing to the specified customer is completed as claimed. That is, Sisley's method does not explicitly include this confirmation step.

Bushey discloses a system and method similar to those of Sloo and Sisley, including the claimed message transfer mechanism [16] configured to transfer a message [survey] to the customer [2] for confirming the customer's request has been satisfactorily handled by the responding person after the customer's request has been handled [See column 11, lines 25-30] as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Bushey's service satisfaction confirmation step to the system and method of Sloo v. Sisley above to obtain the invention as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a means of gauging customer satisfaction with the provided service for enhancing customer service during future calls, as provided by Bushey.

Referring to claim 6, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley and Bushey as applied to claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 6 and the corresponding portion of Bushey's specification, as well as column 3, lines 1-5, for the details of this disclosure. Sloo v. Sisley v. Bushey teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the message transfer mechanism [16] transfers the message prepared as an e-mail or performs a message service in a mobile communication network [See column 3, lines 1-5 and column 9, lines 39-49] as claimed.

Referring to claim 10, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley & Bushey as applied to claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. The customer's sensitivity is confirmed by comparing used words transferred during the customer's service request with predetermined reference particulars of sensitivity classification as claimed. See the discussion regarding claim 1 above, as well as Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Bushey's specification, for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 11-14, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley & Bushey as applied to claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 1 and the corresponding portion of Sisley's specification, and Figures 3-4 and the corresponding portions of Bushey's specification, for this disclosure. Sloo v. Sisley v. Bushey teaches the method of classifying the customer's sensitivity as claimed.

Referring to claims 21 & 23, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley and Bushey above discloses the invention as claimed. See the discussions regarding claims 4-5 above, and the cited portions of the specifications therein, for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 24-26 are rejected on the same basis as claim 5, in light of the basis for claim 8. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 5 and 8 above, and the cited portions of the specifications therein, for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 27-29 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6, in light of the basis for claim 25. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 24-25 above, and the cited portions of the specifications therein, for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 30-36, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley and Bushey as applied to claim 25 above discloses the invention as claimed. Bushey's customer satisfaction confirming survey steps, as applied to the modified system of Sloo v. Sisley above, performs the confirming as claimed. See Figures 1-8 and the corresponding portions of Bushey's specification for this disclosure.

6. Claims 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of Sisley as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,405 to Suzuki.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2 and 3 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 1-3 above for the details of this disclosure. Sloo v. Sisley does not explicitly allow the customer to select a specified responding person from a group of recommended responding persons as claimed. Suzuki discloses a system and method similar to those of Sloo and Sisley, wherein the customer is allowed to select a specified responding person as claimed. See Figures 17-19 and the corresponding portions of Suzuki's specification (particularly Figs. 19A & 19B) for the

details of this disclosure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Suzuki's functionality of allowing the customer to choose the responding person into the system and method of Sloo v. Sisley as above, to obtain the invention as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow the user more flexibility in cases where more than one qualified responding person is available to respond to the request.

Claim 39 is rejected on the same basis as claims 15 & 37. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 8, 15 & 37 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 40 is rejected on the same basis as claim 2, in light of the basis for claim 39 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1-2, 8, 15 and 37 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 41 and 42, the system and method of Sloo in view of Sisley and Suzuki as applied to claim 39 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 1-2 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification for this disclosure. Sisley's (as modified by Sloo & Suzuki) assigner/scheduler system updates the reservation [assignment] information and the responding persons schedule [calendar] information as claimed.

7. Claims 43-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo in view of Sisley and Suzuki as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Bushey.

Claims 43-44 are rejected on the same basis as claims 4-6 and 37. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 37 above for the details of this disclosure. In particular, Suzuki's functionality, as added to Sloo v. Sisley in claim 37 above, includes a graphical user interface configured to display to the customer at least one responding person...[See Figs. 9A & 9B and corresponding portions of specification], and is further modified by Bushey as in claims 5-6 above to obtain the invention as claimed.

Claim 45 is rejected on the same basis as claims 5, 25 & 43 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 25 and 43 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 46 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6, in light of the basis for claim 45. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 5-6, 25, 43 and 45 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 47, 48, 49 and 50 are rejected on the same basis as claims 26, 28, 29 and 27 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 46 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 5-6, 25-29 and 45-46 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 51-56 are rejected on the same basis as claims 30-35 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 45 above. See the discussions regarding claims 30-35 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claim 57, the system and method of Sloo v. Sisley v. Suzuki v. Bushey as applied to claim 45 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 1-3 and the corresponding portions of Sisley's specification, as well as Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Bushey's specification, for the details of this disclosure.

Sloo v. Sisley v. Suzuki v. Bushey distinguishes between new and registered users as claimed. Refer specifically to Figures 1-4 of Bushey's specification for this disclosure.

Claim 58 is rejected on the same basis as claim 36, in light of the basis for claim 45 above. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 2, 8, 25, 36 and 45 above for the details of this disclosure.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 23-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2161

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 571-272-4020. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bdg
17 December 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100